

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

In the specification, paragraph [0002] has been amended. No claims have been canceled, amended, or added. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

In the Office Action, the disclosure was objected to due to minor informalities. In part “a” of the objection, it was asserted that there was no description of Fig. 4 in the detailed description. There is, in fact, a description of Fig. 4 in paragraph [0024] of the detailed description. Applicants have amended paragraph [0002] to correct the minor informality noted in part “b” of the objection. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the disclosure be withdrawn.

Lastly, claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-23, 25-31, and 33-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Petty et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,342,907). Although claims 8, 16, 24, and 32 were not listed in line 1 of paragraph 4 of the Office Action as being rejected, they are addressed in the body of the rejection. Accordingly, it is assumed that claims 1-40 have been rejected under § 102(e) over Petty.

Claim 1 recites that a method for dynamically developing a user interface in an existing software application comprises invoking a user interface developer component during the execution of the software application, identifying one or more fields to include in the user interface, and associating a field type for each of the identified one or more fields. Claim 1 further recites that the method comprises saving the identified one or more fields and associated field types in a user interface definition file, and generating the user interface based on the user interface definition file during the execution of the software application.

Petty discloses that a PDML panel 124 is a panel defined by a programmer using tags and syntax that defines the panel definition markup language (PDML), each panel having one or more components (column 6, lines 63-66). A resource bundle 125 is a language-specific

bundle of information used by a panel to display its various components (column 6, line 66-column 7, line 2). Run-time managers 126 process PDML panels 124 and resource bundles 125 to generate a displayed pane, and are defined using a set of Java classes in a Java class library 200 (column 7, lines 8-11). A GUI panel builder 127 is a tool that provides a graphical user interface for defining panels in PDML and uses a WYSIWYG editor that allows graphic building of panels for a Windows environment that are platform independent (column 7, lines 23-31). The tags providing the desired functionality of the PDML are described from column 10, line 53 – column 20, line 47.

In the rejection, it was asserted that the recited “invoking a user interface development component” corresponded to column 6, lines 42-44 of Petty and the recited “during the execution of the software application” corresponded to column 3, lines 30-32 of Petty. The first reference states:

XML definition 123 of PDML defines the features of PDML that allow a programmer to define a panel and components on the panel.

and the second reference states:

A graphical editor allows the creation and modification of platform-independent user interface panels without programming directly in the specification language.

Regarding the first reference, the XML definition of PDML is not a user interface development component, but rather merely defines the tags used by the component, i.e., the graphical editor, of Petty to create and define an interface panel. Further, regarding the second reference, the graphical editor disclosed by Petty is in fact the component for creating an interface panel, not an existing software application that is executing while the component is invoked.

Accordingly, in contrast to claim 1, Petty does not invoke a user interface developer component during the execution of an existing software application and generate the user interface based on the user interface definition file during the execution of the software application. Rather, Petty discloses an independent graphical editor for creating interface panels. There is nothing in Petty that discloses or suggests invoking the graphical editor during the execution of an existing software application, nor is there any disclosure or

suggestion that the thus created interface panel is generated during the execution of the software application. In other words, Petty does not disclose or suggest dynamically developing a user interface in an existing software application, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Petty.

Claims 2-8 are also patentably distinguishable from Petty by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, as well as their additional recitations. For example, claim 8 recites that the user interface developer component is implemented as a plug-in for the software application. In the rejection, it is asserted that column 3, lines 22-25 of Petty corresponds to claim 8. This reference merely discloses that a specification language allows a user to define platform-independent user interface panels without detailed knowledge of complex computer programming languages. There is nothing in this reference that discloses or suggests that the graphical editor of Petty could be a plug-in for an existing software application. Being platform independent allows the graphical editor of Petty to create interface panels for any type of platform, but that in no way suggests the graphical editor is or could be a plug-in for an existing software application. Accordingly, claim 8 further distinguishes the claimed invention from Petty.

Claims 9-40 are patentably distinguishable from Petty for reasons analogous to claim 1 as described above.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date October 20, 2007

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Phillip J. Artavia *Reg. No.*
for / William T. Ellis *38,819*
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,874